RESEARCH REPORT

Transition from Jail to Community (TJC) Initiative

Implementation Success and Challenges in Jacksonville, Florida

Janeen Buck Willison
URBAN INSTITUTE

Kevin Warwick
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS ASSOCIATES

Emma Kurs
URBAN INSTITUTE

Gary Christensen
CORRECTIONS PARTNERS

June 2016

URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

NIC National Institute of Corrections

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) is an agency within the US Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons. NIC provides training, technical assistance, information services, and policy/program development assistance to federal, state, and local corrections agencies. NIC also provides leadership to influence correctional policies, practices, and operations nationwide in areas of emerging interest and concern to correctional executives and practitioners as well as public policymakers.

Copyright © June 2016. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute. Cover image from Associated Press.

Contents

Acknowledgments **iv**

Glossary **v**

Introduction **1**

The TJC Model and Technical Assistance Approach 1

Data Sources 5

Jacksonville Jail Transition at Baseline 7

Preimplementation Strengths 8

Jacksonville's TJC Objectives 10

TJC Structure, Leadership, and Collaboration **11**

Leadership 11

Organizational Culture 12

TJC Collaborative Structure and Joint Ownership 13

Targeted Intervention Strategies **19**

Screening, Assessment, and the TJC Target Population 19

Prerelease Interventions 22

Case Handoff and Continuity of Care 24

Community-Based Interventions 25

Self-Evaluation and Sustainability **26**

Self-Evaluation and Data-Driven Approaches 26

Sustaining Jail Reentry in Jacksonville 27

Conclusion **30**

Notes **33**

References **35**

Statement of Independence **37**

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared under Cooperative Agreements 12CS07GKK1, 13CS08GKK1, and 14CS04GKK1 from the National Institute of Corrections, US Department of Justice. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the US Department of Justice. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at www.urban.org/support.

The authors wish to thank all the dedicated TJC partners in Jacksonville, whose good work is discussed in this report. We are appreciative of the leadership and guidance of Sheriff John Rutherford and Director Tara Wildes. Many individuals made significant contributions to the TJC effort there, but we would like to specifically recognize TJC coordinator Chief Tammy Morris, Katherine Burns, Assistant Chief Ruben Bryant, Sergeant George Pratt, Sergeant Equilla Stallworth, Ken Arnold, and all those involved with the Jacksonville TJC core team.

We are grateful to the National Institute of Corrections as a whole and NIC Director Jim Cosby in particular for their support and partnership throughout the Transition from Jail to Community Initiative. We thank NIC TJC Project Manager Pat Taylor for her leadership throughout TJC Phase 2. We appreciate Glenn Watson and Danny Downes of NIC's Jails Division for their many contributions to the Phase 2 TJC work.

Finally, we acknowledge the members of the TJC National Technical Assistance and Evaluation team, including Gary Christensen, Jeff Mellow, and the Pretrial Justice Institute , as well as our TJC partners in the six Phase 1 learning sites, the other Phase 2 sites, and the California Realignment sites, who constitute the TJC community of practice and who have helped us to continually deepen and refine our understanding of how effective jail transition strategies can be implemented, tested, and improved.

Glossary

ACTS—Applied Correctional Transition Strategy Software

CAU—Crime Analysis Unit

CBI—Cognitive-Based Interventions

CBT—Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

CJCC—Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee

CMIS—Case Management Information System

CTC—Community Transition Center

EBP—Evidence-Based Practice

GED—General Educational Development

JSO—Jacksonville Sheriff's Office

JMS—Jail Management System

JADE—Jacksonville Area Discharge Enhancement

JREC—Jacksonville Reentry Center

MCC—Montgomery Correctional Center

NIC—National Institute of Corrections

OMS—Offender Management System

PDF—Pretrial Detention Facility

PSU—Pretrial Services Unit

QA—Quality Assurance

RRHS—River Region Human Services

SAMHSA—Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration

SOAR—SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access, Recovery

T4C—Thinking for a Change

TA—Technical Assistance

TC—Therapeutic Community

TJC—Transition from Jail to Community

Urban—Urban Institute

Introduction

Nearly 12 million individuals enter the nation's approximately 3,100 jails each year (Minton and Golinelli 2014). With 60 percent of the jail population turning over each week, roughly the same number return to their respective communities. Many will recidivate (Roman et al. 2006; Uchida et al. 2009). This is not surprising given the many challenges faced by jail inmates: high rates of substance abuse and dependence (Karberg and James 2005), mental health issues (James and Glaze 2006), poor physical health (Maruschak 2006), low levels of educational attainment (Wolf Harlow 2003), and a high incidence of homelessness (Greenberg and Rosenheck 2008).

To assist local jurisdictions with facilitating successful reintegration from jail, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) partnered with the Urban Institute (Urban) in 2007 to launch the Transition from Jail to Community (TJC) Initiative. The purpose of the TJC Initiative is to address the specific reentry challenges associated with transition from jail. During Phase 1 of the initiative, the NIC/Urban national TJC team, which also included Alternative Solutions Associates Inc., Corrections Partners Inc., and John Jay College of Criminal Justice, developed a comprehensive model to transform the jail transition process and ultimately enhance both the success of individuals returning to the community from jail and public safety in communities throughout the United States. More comprehensive than a discrete program, the TJC model is directed at long-term systems change and emphasizes a collaborative, community-based approach.

After designing the model, the national TJC team provided technical assistance (TA) to facilitate model implementation in six learning sites: Davidson County, TN; Denver, CO; Douglas County, KS; Kent County, MI; La Crosse County, WI; and Orange County, CA. A process and systems change evaluation in the six Phase 1 sites found that TJC model implementation was associated with significant, positive systems change (Buck Willison et al. 2012). Six additional Phase 2 learning sites, including the City of Jacksonville (Duval County), joined the TJC Initiative in the fall of 2012, as well as two California jurisdictions receiving TJC technical assistance to assist them with managing the policy changes associated with Public Safety Realignment in that state.

The TJC Model and Technical Assistance Approach

The TJC model was designed to help jurisdictions achieve two goals: (1) improve public safety by reducing the threat of harm to persons and property by individuals released from local jails to their home communities; and (2) increase successful reintegration outcomes – from employment retention and sobriety to reduced

homelessness and improved health and family connectedness – for these individuals. Further, the model is intended to be sufficiently adaptable that it can be implemented in any of the 2,860 jail jurisdictions in the United States (Stephan and Walsh 2011), despite difference in population size, resources, and priorities. The TJC model, depicted in Figure 1, contains both system level elements, at which strategic and systems change work occurs, and an intervention level, at which work with individual clients occurs.

FIGURE 1

TJC Model

TJC is a systems change initiative, rather than a discrete program. It represents an integrated approach spanning organizational boundaries to deliver needed information, services, and case management to people released from jail. Boundary-spanning collaborative partnerships are necessary because transition from jail to the community is neither the sole responsibility of the jail nor of the community. Accordingly, effective transition strategies rely on collaboration among jail- and community-based partners and joint ownership of the problems associated with jail transition and their solutions. The NIC/Urban team was committed to the TJC model and implementation approach being consistent with evidence-based practice regarding effective reentry, inclusive of both the types of interventions that needed to be available (e.g., cognitive-behavioral programming) and the structure of the overall intervention continuum (e.g., basing it on risk and need factors determined through application of valid risk/needs assessment instruments). The five elements of the TJC model are:

- *Leadership, Vision, and Organizational Culture*. The development of an effective jail transition strategy requires the active involvement of key decision-makers to set expectations, to identify important issues, to articulate a clear vision of success, and to engage staff and other stakeholders in the effort.
- *Collaborative Structure and Joint Ownership*. The jail and its community partners must hold joint responsibility for successful transition. A structure for the TJC work should facilitate collaboration and allow for meaningful joint planning and decision-making.
- *Data-Driven Understanding of Local Reentry*. In a data-driven approach to reentry, collection of objective, empirical data and regular analysis of those data inform and drive decision-making and policy formation.
- *Targeted Intervention Strategies*. Targeted intervention strategies comprise the basic building blocks for effective jail transition. Targeting of program interventions should be based on information about an individual's risk of reoffending and criminogenic needs, information that is gathered through screening and assessment. Intervention delivery should also be guided and coordinated through case planning.
- *Self-Evaluation and Sustainability*. Self-evaluation involves the use of data to guide operations, monitor progress, and inform decision-making about changes or improvements that may need to be made to the initiative. Sustainability involves the use of strategies and mechanisms to ensure that the progress of the initiative is sustained over time despite changes in leadership, policy, funding, and staffing.

In order to test whether the model was in fact adaptable to different local contexts and to understand the shape model implementation could take in jurisdictions with different priorities and capacities, the NIC/Urban TJC national team provided 14 TJC learning sites with multi-year technical assistance around model implementation (Figure 2). Phase 2 TJC learning sites, including Jacksonville, received intensive technical assistance to support model implementation over the course of two and half years, starting in September 2012 and concluding in June 2015. The TJC TA included an analysis of gaps in reentry practice relative to the TJC model, a facilitated strategic planning process, and training in areas such as delivery of evidence-based programming, performance measurement, and sustainability planning.

This report details the TJC implementation experience in Jacksonville, Florida. It discusses the development of the TJC strategy there, the policy and practice changes associated with its implementation, and the factors that facilitated or impeded successful TJC model implementation. TJC technical assistance to

the sites was structured around the five model elements. Given the interrelated nature of the elements, this report discusses implementation of some of the model elements in single chapters. Chapter 2, for example, discusses the structural, strategic, and collaborative aspects of TJC implementation encompassed in the model's Leadership, Vision, and Organizational Culture components and Collaborative Structure and Joint Ownership elements. Chapter 3 covers the Targeted Intervention Strategies component of the model, including practices employed to bring about behavior change at the client level. Chapter 4 discusses the implementation of the Self-Evaluation and Sustainability component of the model, building the foundation for maintaining and expanding the TJC work. As TJC is designed to be a data-driven approach, work relative to the Data-Driven Understanding of Reentry model element is interwoven with all the other model elements, and is therefore integrated into each report chapter.

FIGURE 2

TJC Learning Sites

Phase 1 TA Period, Denver and Douglas County: September 2008 through February 2012
Phase 1 TA Period, remaining sites: September 2009 through February 2012
Phase 2 TA Period: September 2012 through June 2015
AB 109 (Realignment) TA Period: December 2012 through June 2015

Data Sources

This report draws on multiple sources of information collected in support of the implementation and systems change evaluation work undertaken by the Urban Institute:

- Documentation of TJC TA provision, including call notes and on-site observation of reentry operations.
- Data collected for the core TJC performance measures as well as any other data analysis conducted to inform TJC strategy development and implementation.
- Review of locally developed reentry materials such as procedural guidelines, program documents, and policy manuals.
- Two waves of Jacksonville TJC stakeholder survey data. This brief online survey measured stakeholder perceptions of system functioning specific to collaboration, resource and information-sharing, interagency cooperation and trust, organizational culture, and the quality and availability of services available to individuals who transition from jail to the community. It was designed to detect and measure system-level change.
    - Wave 1, conducted in spring 2013 with 39 respondents representing 25 agencies throughout the Jacksonville/Duval County criminal justice system and community.
    - Wave 2, conducted in fall 2014 with 33 respondents representing 18 agencies throughout the Jacksonville/Duval County criminal justice system and community.
- Semi-structured interviews with Jacksonville stakeholders (e.g., the TJC coordinator, jail and facility administrator(s) and/or sheriff, members of the site's reentry council, jail staff, and staff from key partner agencies) to capture the site's implementation experiences and document the progress of TJC implementation, the development and evolution of the site's local reentry strategies including the range of activities pursued, and critical lessons learned. Discussion topics included the individual's involvement in the initiative, reflections on the pace and progress of implementation, impressions about core elements of the model, anticipated challenges, and technical assistance needs. Two rounds of stakeholder phone interviewers were conducted, the first in late spring 2013 and the second in fall 2014, with up to eight stakeholders from within Jacksonville's core team.

Taken together, the information generated by the data sources and evaluation activities paint a rich portrait of Jacksonville's implementation experiences, strategies, challenges, and progress.

Jacksonville Jail Transition at Baseline

The City of Jacksonville, located in northeastern Florida, is the county seat of Duval County and one of forty consolidated city-county government structures in the United States.[1] The city is also unique in its size: it is the largest by land area in the country, 918 square miles, with approximately 845,000 residents spread across a mix of rural, urban, and suburban communities.

The Jacksonville Sheriff's Office (JSO) serves as the county's primary law enforcement entity, employing nearly 3,000 staff across its patrol, corrections, and pretrial services divisions. The patrol division is responsible for policing and crime prevention services in all but five communities. The County's Pretrial Services Unit (PSU), located under the Jails Division of the JSO Corrections Department, supervises hundreds of low risk pretrial defendants in the community to allow these individuals to maintain employment and/or attend school. The PSU also monitors defendants' compliance with court-order terms of release through regular reporting and random drug testing, and it refers clients to health and mental health services, drug and alcohol treatment, and educational, vocational training, and housing services. In 2011, nearly 2,200 individuals were supervised and served by the PSU, according to Jacksonville's TJC application.

The JSO's Department of Corrections operates three facilities, housing nearly 3,900 inmates[2] of which 55 percent are pretrial detainees. The John E. Goode Pre-Trial Detention Facility (PDF) holds an average daily population of 2,929 individuals; the county's two sentenced facilities, the Montgomery Correctional Center Prison (MCC) and the Community Transition Center (CTC), maintain an average daily population of 728 and 308 individuals, respectively.[3] Length of stay varies by facility as well: in 2011, individuals sentenced to the MCC stayed an average of 102 days, compared to 139 days for those ordered to the CTC and 146 days for those detained in the PDF. Prior to joining TJC, each facility offered a variety of programs and services, ranging from educational and employment services to substance abuse support groups, delivered primarily by community-based providers and volunteers. Many of these programs, however, were homegrown or centered on an outdated model; few used evidence-based curricula. The JSO did not provide the general population with any cognitive behavioral programming, a foundational evidence-based intervention for reducing the likelihood of reoffending (Pearson et al. 2002; Wilson, Bouffard, and MacKenzie 2005; Lipsey, Landenberger and Wilson 2007). Moreover, all programs were voluntary. As one stakeholder observed, this meant that services weren't geared towards the individuals who needed them most – those at highest risk for reoffending. Like many jurisdictions, the JSO did not screen the jail population for risk to reoffend or assess the criminogenic risks and needs of those inmates identified as most likely to reoffend. In short, prior to TJC, assessment in the jail was limited to the classification intake process which informed inmate housing placements.

BOX 1

Jacksonville Pre-TJC Programming and Services Array

Prior to TJC, individuals housed in Jacksonville's three facilities could access approximately a dozen distinct programs and services including three evidence-based interventions (see bolded text):

- Anger Management
- 12-step support programming
- Mental health services
- **Living in Balance** substance treatment curriculum
- **Ready 4 Work**
- **Inside Out Dads** parenting classes
- Bridges to Life a restorative justice curriculum; and
- ABE and GED classes
- Legal Aid assistance
- HIV Communicable Disease educational programming

The 300-bed CTC, referred to locally as the "Programs Facility," offered the most coordinated and comprehensive programming for sentenced inmates through its Matrix House substance abuse treatment program. Operated and staffed by River Region Human Services (RRHS), Matrix House is a 135-bed licensed therapeutic community (TC) that provides 120 days of intensive treatment centered on the evidence-based *Living in Balance* curriculum. Those who successfully complete Matrix House are eligible for up to 12 months of postrelease aftercare services including case management and transition assistance (RRHS program materials obtained November 2012).[4] Apart from the CTC's Matrix House program, inmates releasing from the other JSO facilities received limited assistance – namely a copy of a resource guide to area services.

Preimplementation Strengths

Several critical elements necessary for successful systems change were in place in Jacksonville prior to the launch of TJC. First and foremost, the Jacksonville Sheriff and his staff, including the Director of Corrections, were highly supportive of reentry and had articulated a commitment to refine operations in keeping with evidence-based practices and reentry principles; they also realized this would involve a degree of culture

change and were cognizant of the potential challenges associated with such a shift. Specifically, with the assistance of TJC subject matter experts, Jacksonville stakeholders sought to implement core correctional practices such as universal risk screening and in-depth risk/needs assessment targeting those inmates at highest risk for reoffending and directing them into intensive intervention.

Equally important, the JSO had good working relationships with a number of community providers and volunteer organizations. In addition to its aforementioned relationship with RRHS, the JSO was also well-connected to the broader community through the Jacksonville Area Discharge Enhancement (JADE) committee. JADE regularly brought together over 50 community-based service providers with different areas of expertise, including substance abuse treatment, employment, and education, to address the needs of formerly incarcerated individuals released in Duval County. JADE's mission is to provide and oversee services during and after incarceration with the aim of improving the quality of life for the ex-offender returning to the community, thereby increasing the chance for successful reentry.[5] At the time TJC launched in Jacksonville, the committee was led by the JSO's Chief of the Prisons Division. In addition to numerous service providers, representatives from a number of governmental agencies (e.g., Probation, Florida Department of Children and Families, and the Florida Department of Corrections) also participated in the committee.

The site also had a solid model for postrelease reentry services. Although relatively few resources were available to individuals releasing from JSO facilities prior to TJC, and only a few of the available services were aligned with evidence-based practices (risk/needs assessment did not drive treatment, for example), local leaders, sparked by concerns over an increasing number DOC releases, had made a significant investment in prisoner reentry. Three years prior to the launch of TJC, the city of Jacksonville funded the Jacksonville Reentry Center (JREC) a community-based "one stop shop"[6] for prisoners returning to Duval County following release from the Florida Department of Corrections. As such, JREC's primary clients were those released from the state system or longer-term incarceration; local releases were informed of JREC's services, but relatively few accessed them, according to Jacksonville's TJC application**.** Under TJC, Jacksonville stakeholders sought to extend JREC services to the jail population postrelease and to leverage the expertise of JREC's staff to establish a coordinated continuum of care.

Lastly, Jacksonville brought substantial analytic capabilities and a demonstrated commitment to data-driven decision-making to the TJC initiative. The JSO's Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) regularly conducted crime analyses for the Sheriff and his Executive Team's review, including reports on the daily jail population, frequent jail users, and an annual recidivism analyses. CAU staff could also access data from the JSO's Case Management Information System (CMIS) which captured criminal charges, inmate demographic data, bond amounts, inmate contact logs (which are often used for investigative purposes), inmate special conditions, and inmate scheduling. Additionally, Jacksonville had implemented a program module that documented

inmate participation in treatment or other programming and for notes on current status (e.g., success in completing treatment). Key community-based partner, JREC, also compiled data on service referrals, utilization and completion status, as well as rearrests and probation status. On balance, these capabilities suggested Jacksonville was well-positioned to conduct analyses that could inform its efforts to design and implement a responsive jail transition strategy.

Perhaps, most importantly, Jacksonville had amassed a group of criminal justice and community-based stakeholders committed to reentry and eager to enhance current practice.

Jacksonville's TJC Objectives

Through TJC technical assistance, Jacksonville stakeholders sought both to build on these strengths and to address critical gaps in reentry practice and programming by expanding its use of evidence-based practices with early work focused on (1) selecting and implementing both a universal risk screener and an in-depth criminogenic risk/needs assessment tools; (2) analyses of the jail population by risk to reoffend; (3) instituting cognitive-based interventions for the jail's population at moderate to high risk to reoffend; and (4) enhancing its prerelease array of services in order to improve individuals' preparedness and success in reentering the community.[7] In doing so, Jacksonville would further align its reentry practices with the principles of effective intervention (Matthews et al. 2001; Andrews and Bonta 2010).[8] Lastly, Jacksonville also saw room for growth in its community-based interventions: the city hoped to leverage the programming strengths and EBP capacities of JREC by creating a continuum of care that engaged individuals before leaving the JSO's facilities and continued into the community. Ultimately, Jacksonville wanted to implement a comprehensive public safety approach that leveraged its considerable community assets and successful criminal justice-community partnerships to establish a continuum of services spanning from arrest through reentry.

The remainder of this report explores and examines Jacksonville's efforts to achieve these objectives.

TJC Structure, Leadership, and Collaboration

Development of an effective jail transition strategy requires the active involvement of policymakers from both the jail and the community to articulate a clear vision of success, set expectations, identify important issues, and engage staff and other stakeholders in the effort. This leadership is necessary to align the cultures of partnering organizations for the common purpose of facilitating successful transition into the community. Leadership must be engaged at multiple levels. Collaborative structures are needed to make strategic decisions about jail transition priorities and resource allocation and to create continuity of care and approach between agencies and across the point of release.

A TJC collaborative structure must achieve four things:

- Inspire, increase, and maintain support for jail transition from a broad array of community partners.
- Identify, prioritize, and build consensus around actions needed to improve the jail transition system.
- Ensure that these actions are taken.
- Monitor the transition process and practice to ensure accountability and improve the approach as needed.

Leadership

Jacksonville's system change efforts benefitted from buy-in among criminal justice and community leaders. Although not intricately involved with TJC implementation, Sherriff John Rutherford clearly articulated his expectation that Jacksonville's correctional operations would align with evidence-based recidivism reduction strategies and brought that vision not only to the JSO's jail administrators and Director of Corrections, but also Jacksonville's Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC), which provided policy-level oversight to the TJC initiative. Embracing the Sheriff's vision for a more evidence-based correctional system, JSO Director of Corrections Tara Wildes provided critical "hands on" leadership for the initiative by taking an active role in the initiative's implementation body (TJC core team); she also served as the liaison between the TJC core team and the CJCC. Working closely with Assistant Chief Tammy Morris, the initiative's designated TJC coordinator, Director Wildes, helped guide the selection of risk screening and needs assessment tools, as well as engage

the leadership of JSO facilities, particularly the CTC, and arrange the full time assignment of the JSO's then Training Coordinator, and later Program Lieutenant, to the initiative. Director Wildes also supported the Initiative's efforts to integrate correctional officers (i.e., line staff) into TJC planning and implementation efforts; doing so was a critical first step in the JSO's culture change efforts.

Organizational Culture

Broadly speaking, organizational culture refers to "the set of shared, taken-for-granted implicit assumptions that a group holds and that determines how it perceives, thinks about, and reacts to its various environments" (Schein 1996); it can also be described as "the values, assumptions, and beliefs people hold that drive the way the institution functions and the way people think and behave" (Byrne 2005). Culture is often an unspoken driver of behavior,

BOX 2

Support for Reentry and Evidence-Based Practices

While more than 80 percent of Jacksonville survey respondents at Wave 1 held leadership (as opposed to frontline staff) positions, nearly all agreed or strongly agreed with a series of nine questions measuring support for evidence-based practices. The vast majority, for example, agreed or strongly agreed that programs have a positive effect on individuals while they are detained. Most stakeholders (94 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that decisions about who to target for programming and services should be based on screening and assessment and that risk and needs assessment should guide decisions about what programs and services individuals receive. When asked what criteria should determine whether an individual is allowed to participate in programs, "Risk and Needs Assessment" was selected by 74 percent of respondents, indicating solid support for this evidence-based practice. When surveyed again later in the initiative, just 67 percent of respondents held leadership positions, indicating a greater share of line staff took the survey. Nevertheless, support for reentry practices and EBPs remained strong at Wave 2: 80 percent agreed programming has a positive effect on inmates; 94 percent agreed it is important that people who work in facilities support offender programming; 90 percent agreed it is important to get offenders to program on time; and 97 percent agreed assessment results should guide program access and receipt.

Strong top-down support for sound reentry practices and jail transition was particularly important in Jacksonville. Like many jail systems, the predominate culture was understandably and heavily focused on compliance and maintaining order (i.e., safety and security). Programming and inmate access to programming

were not necessarily pressing concerns for corrections staff. In turn, not all service providers were accustomed to recidivism reduction practices such as using criminogenic risk/need assessment tools to determine program eligibility or manualized curricula that aligned with and reinforced proven cognitive principles for positive behavior change. For these reasons, the collaborative struggled at times to secure buy-in from mid-level management and line staff, both correctional officers and service providers, particularly as the NIC/Urban national team's technical assistance challenged existing practices. Yet, one stakeholder described the potential in challenging the status quo this way:

> "When you bring everyday people in [and say] you have a proven method, it gets the attention of key individuals, and you get two faces—a 'this is interesting' or a 'this is nonsense' face. Either face is important." Plus, "[it] leaves individuals wanting to have knowledge of something they didn't have before, and brings about debate."

The NIC/Urban national TJC TA team helped garner buy- in for adopting new practices by familiarizing staff with the evidence on recidivism reduction principles and practices, and providing a forum for discussion and group learning around those issues. Staff buy-in is critical to any systems-level change. Yet, the sheer size of the JSO system made it difficult to spread awareness about jail transition to all staff in a manner that could meaningfully signal culture change and engender buy-in. In 2013, the Jacksonville collaborative took a proactive approach to increase staff buy-in by designing a web-based training to familiarize line staff across the JSO with TJC and reentry principles; the team also explained the organization's jail transition work at various staff retreats such as the Lieutenants' retreat. Perhaps the most effective strategy the JSO employed was to train and engage more than 100 correctional staff as *Thinking for a Change* (T4C) facilitators. Doing so not only exposed these staff to key principles of effective corrections intervention but also made them indirect ambassadors [for this new approach] as they talked with coworkers about T4C and inevitably the larger reentry work of the TJC initiative. Ultimately, six correctional officers were also added to the TJC core team. As one stakeholder commented, this was an important development for both staff and inmates as it reflected a change in the "*general mindset of the agency ... that made a difference with the inmates*" – a positive difference that was reported to the Jacksonville core team by correctional officers and inmate family members alike.

TJC Collaborative Structure and Joint Ownership

Consistent with the TJC model, Jacksonville engaged policy-level executive leaders, agency and operations management, and direct services staff in its jail transition work. Figure 3 depicts Jacksonville's early TJC collaborative structure.

FIGURE 3

Jacksonville TJC Initiative Structure

Development, oversight, and implementation of Jacksonville's TJC work occurred primarily through the site's TJC core team and its subcommittees. Convened early in the TJC initiative, the core team's initial membership included several JSO Captains, a Program Lieutenant, the administrative Sergeant for Pretrial Services, the JREC Executive Director, two analysts from the JSO's Crime Analysis Unit, and the Senior Director of Intervention Services at River Region Human Services. This initial group included representatives from only two of the JSO's three facilities, which reflected the group's sensibility for where reforms would focus.[9] Over time, the group's membership evolved and expanded to reflect the initiative's expanding "system" focus. As one stakeholder observed, "*TJC caused Jacksonville to reassess who needed jail transition services and, in turn, realize the importance of integrating the CTC into the core team*." As such, the core team expanded to include the Assistant Chief of the CTC, the Correctional Services Program Manager, and a senior counselor from the CTC's Matrix House program.

Jacksonville also established several workgroups that involved JSO and community-based partner staff beyond the core team. Initial work groups included:

- **Programs committee** – tasked with surveying the landscape of programming (including the use of manualized, evidence-based programs) available to JSO inmates pre- and postrelease, this group identified gaps in the service continuum and potential priorities;

- **Screening and assessment committee –** this group worked closely with the TJC national team to research and select a risk screener by which to quickly determine inmates' risk of reoffending, and a risk/needs assessment tool.
- **Data and self-evaluation committee** – staffed mainly by the JSO's CAU analysts and an IT officer, this group compiled the TJC core indicators and analyzed operations data to inform and monitor the initiative's efforts.

Ultimately, these workgroups were subsumed into a single quality assurance (QA) committee in early 2015. Focused on resolving any operational issues specific to Jacksonville's jail transition strategy and monitoring the fidelity of procedures and processes instituted during the TJC technical assistance period, the QA committee essentially became the functional equivalent of the TJC core team and was tasked with continuing Jacksonville's jail transition work after the TJC TA period concluded. By the end of the TA period, the QA committee was meeting monthly. Several members of the core team, supplemented by a few additional JSO staff, comprised the QA committee. Late in the initiative, Jacksonville also convened a TJC Executive Committee consisting of a smaller subset of core team members —namely the Director of Corrections, Chief of the JSO's jails division (and TJC coordinator), JREC Executive Director, RRHS Senior Director, and Program Lieutenant — ostensibly to advance critical discussions and targeted decision-making. The changing configuration of Jacksonville's operations-level collaborative reflects the reality that collaboration is fluid and a flexible approach may be needed to achieve differing implementation tasks; this flexibility can also serve sustainability, as discussed in later sections of this report.

Two key groups provided oversight and assistance to the TJC initiative: the CJCC and JADE. The CJCC provided TJC with a link to Jacksonville's executive-level criminal justice and social service policy leaders. Comprised of 14 key community and criminal justice system stakeholders,[10] the CJCC is charged with assessing and planning for county correctional facility requirements and pretrial intervention programs; reviewing, researching, and evaluating existing programs relating to or impacting criminal justice in Duval County, and making recommendations to the Jacksonville City Council on grants, contracts, and initiatives designed to "increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System in Duval County." (JSO 2006). As such, the CJCC provided policy-level oversight for Jacksonville's TJC implementation efforts. Through the JADE committee, TJC connected to the broader provider community and facilitated important information exchange: the TJC core team not only educated community providers on TJC but also worked with these providers to learn about the resources they offered and how best to integrate those providers' resources into the jails' continuum of reentry services.

Throughout the initiative, Jacksonville's level of engagement with these groups remained primarily at the "reporting" level. As a result, Jacksonville did not leverage the potential of these two groups to advance local reentry work to the extent that some Phase 2 TJC sites did (see, for example, the Hennepin County TJC report on how the site engaged its County-level executives to secure resources and advance critical procedural changes). The JSO's connection with JADE, for example, held the potential to directly engage a much broader cross-section of the service provider community in TJC's planning efforts; yet, JREC and RRHS remained the initiative's sole community partners. While JREC and RRHS were unquestionably capable and highly-valued partners, the inclusion of other community partners would have diversified the perspectives and experiences of those "at the table" and potentially broadened the array of services available to transitioning inmates. As discussed in later sections of this report, the NIC/Urban national team also recommended that Jacksonville clarify its executive leadership structure and the relationship between TJC and the CJCC, specifically by developing a strategy for continuing to engage with and secure the support of county leaders throughout changes in those positions. Doing so will enhance the likelihood of sustaining and advancing the site's jail transition work over time.

Nevertheless, Jacksonville's jail transition work benefitted from a solid sense of joint ownership around the issue of jail reentry – a bedrock principle of TJC. Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of stakeholders surveyed six months into the initiative *rejected* the notion that reentry is primarily the jail's responsibility. By the second survey administration in fall 2014, this sentiment was rejected by over 80 percent of respondents, which suggests many stakeholders believe the community and criminal justice system bear responsibility for jail reentry. That sense of joint ownership is also evidenced by the composition of the core team and Jacksonville's history of collaboration around reentry through initiative such as the Jacksonville Journey and JREC.

FIGURE 4

Collaboration among Key Groups

Source: Jacksonville TJC stakeholder survey, 2013–14.

*Other criminal justice agencies included local law enforcement, community corrections, and the courts.

Lastly, data from the stakeholder survey (Figure 4) suggests solid, functional collaboration existed in Jacksonville particularly between criminal justice agencies and service providers. At each survey administration, stakeholders rated collaboration among a combination of groups—service providers, the jail, and other criminal justice agencies besides the jail — using a four-point scale, in which 1 signified "no collaboration" and 4 signified "extensive collaboration." Scores were then averaged to calculate a measure of intensity: the higher the average score, the more extensive the degree of perceived collaboration. At both administrations, stakeholders rated collaboration above the mid-point (2.50) for all groupings, which indicated favorable perceptions of collaboration. At Wave 1, respondents scored collaboration between the jail and other criminal agencies highest at 3.28, while collaboration between the jail and service providers received the lowest score (2.82). Interestingly, by Wave 2, stakeholders rated collaboration highest among the jail and service providers (3.36); in truth, collaboration scores improved or held steady for all combinations.

Survey respondents also answered questions about the frequency (i.e., never, rarely, occasionally, or frequently) with which their respective agency or organization engaged in activities that required collaboration such as sharing resources and information with other agencies, co-locating staff, and partnering

with other agencies to leverage resources. The timeframe was the six months prior to the survey. Analyses suggest ample evidence of functional collaboration among Jacksonville stakeholders at both points in time:

- *Resource-sharing*: At Wave 1, 87 percent of stakeholders reported some degree of resource-sharing in the six months prior to the survey; 64 percent reported that their agency frequently shared materials or resources with other agencies. At Wave 2, 99 percent of respondents reported some level of resource-sharing, with 67 percent indicating it was a frequent practice.
- *Staffing*: At Wave 1, 64 percent of respondents reported having co-located or shared staff in the six months prior to the survey, and 49 percent indicated this was a frequent or occasional practice. At Wave 2, these figures increased to 80 percent and 72 percent respectively.
- *Leveraging resources*: 77 percent of respondents partnered with other agencies to write grants or share the cost of a new resource to build capacity at Wave 1, with 64 percent doing so frequently or occasionally. 84 percent also reported partnering with other agencies in Jacksonville to provide training.

These figures suggest TJC participation enhanced already substantial collaboration among criminal justice and community-based providers.

Targeted Intervention Strategies

Targeted intervention strategies are the basic building blocks of jail transition. Improving transition at the individual level involves introducing specific interventions at critical points along the jail-to-community continuum. Interventions at these key points can improve reintegration and reduce reoffending, thereby increasing public safety. Screening and assessment, transition planning, and program interventions are key elements of this strategy. This chapter discusses the system changes Jacksonville undertook to create a coordinated system of targeted interventions.

The TJC model employs a triage approach to prioritize interventions based on where resources are most needed or most likely to be successful for a rapidly cycling jail population with deep and varied needs. The TJC triage approach is consistent with the research literature that higher-risk individuals should receive higher levels of intervention (Lowenkamp et al. 2006), that interventions intended to reduce recidivism must target criminogenic needs, targets for change that drive criminal behavior (Bonta and Andrews 2007), and that individuals at low risk to reoffend should be subject to minimal intervention, if any (Lowenkamp and Latessa 2004).

Screening, Assessment, and the TJC Target Population

Central to the TJC model's triage approach is the implementation of a two-stage process for (1) determining which inmates are at the greatest risk to reoffend and (2) identifying the needs that must be addressed to reduce recidivism. Like many jail systems, Jacksonville did not ascribe to either process before joining TJC.[11] The jail did not routinely screen inmates for risk to reoffend, and assessment was limited to pretrial services, which used a locally-developed assessment tool and jail intake classification, which relied on a common set of items to determine an inmate's security level for housing assignment. Selecting and implementing evidence-based tools to do so were a critical first task.

BOX 3

Pretrial Practices

As in other TJC learning sites, the Jacksonville core team invested the majority of its efforts on improving its reentry approach for the sentenced population. However, the team also took into consideration the JSO's practices for the pretrial population. In operation prior to TJC, the JSO's Pretrial Supervision Program assesses and supervises individuals deemed eligible for pretrial release. Typically, the program is intended for individuals arrested for a 2nd or 3rd degree non-violent felony or misdemeanor as well as certain individuals court-ordered to pretrial supervision. Once identified for the program, officers at the PSP assessed individuals' risks and needs. Through TJC, and with the support of the judiciary, the JSO introduced a new assessment tool in May 2014: the Florida Multicounty Pretrial Risk Assessment tool. By agreeing to replace the original tool, Jacksonville was able to scale back the number of questions used to make release decisions and both streamline and strengthen the assessment process.

Jacksonville piloted the Proxy Triage Risk Screener ("Proxy") in February 2013, ultimately selecting and fully integrating it into its booking process by May 2013. This three-item risk screener scores individuals on a scale from 2 to 8 points, sorting them into high-, medium- , and low-risk categories based on the individuals' current age, age at first arrest, and number of prior arrests (Bogue et al. 2005). Initial analyses of 3,142 inmates in custody in the JSO on May 31, 2013 (Figure 5) categorized 36 percent (N=1131) of bookings as high risk, 40 percent (N=1266) as medium risk, and 24 percent (N=745) as low risk. Figure 5 also shows the risk profile of inmates by JSO facility. The graphic indicates the JSO's sentenced facilities (MCC and CTC) generally house primarily medium- and high-risk offenders, while the PDF houses the largest share of low-risk offenders; this suggest there may be a pool of individuals booked into the PDF that may be appropriate for pretrial release.[12] Additional analyses including similar "snap shot" examinations of the jail population on August 5, 2013 (N=3406) and February 7, 2014 (N=3217) and an analysis of unqiue bookings (N=7444) in the first quarter of CY2 013 found similar Proxy score distributions.

FIGURE 5

Jacksonville Jail Population by Proxy Risk, May 2013

Notes: PDF = Pretrial Detention Facility. MCC = Montgomery Correctional. CTC = Community Transition Center.

Jacksonville selected the ACTS (Applied Correctional Transition Strategy Software) system as its comprehensive risk/needs assessment tool, with implementation beginning in April 2014. Described as an actuarial assessment and case management system, ACTS allows users to "generate quick risk screen scores, conduct risk screening assessments, and full assessments of an individual inmate's criminogenic needs, and case plans."[13]

Beginning in spring 2014, the Proxy was used to quickly sort the jail population by risk for reoffending, with the intent of identifying sentenced inmates screened as medium- and high-risk (Proxy score of 5–7) to reoffend for in-depth risk/needs assessment with ACTS. Jacksonville also intended to use ACTS to facilitate transition planning and cross-systems tracking of the TJC target population. These processes represented a departure from business as usual in the JSO's facilities, where, prior to TJC, individuals self-selected into programming and services. As one stakeholder noted, "*TJC has undoubtedly made everyone realize we need risk assessments*."

Next, Jacksonville's TJC efforts centered on establishing a coordinated reentry approach for the sentenced population. Jacksonville defined its TJC target population — those inmates who would receive the "full package" of available transition interventions — as individuals screened as medium to high risk (Proxy score of 5–7)[14] to reoffend, who were sentenced to 120 days or more in the MCC or CTC and without any detainers or

holds. There were no prohibitions on specific offenses. In turn, individuals returning to a community outside Duval County would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Initial analyses indicated that average length of stay for MCC and CTC inmates scoring 5–7 on the Proxy was 92 days and 128 days, respectively; in each facility, inmates meeting these criteria comprised approximately 67 percent (N=348, MCC) and 73 percent (N=173, CTC) of the facility's population. Aware that delivery of prerelease services, particularly the full complement of T4C and initial case management meetings, might be challenging in the MCC where average length of stay fell short of the desired 120 days specified in Jacksonville's target population parameters, the TJC core team closely monitored this aspect of implementation.

The goal was for all eligible cases to be assessed with ACTS prior to program placement. As discussed in the next section, Jacksonville ultimately created a 30-bed program unit in the MCC to house "TJC cases" and administer core programming, namely *Thinking for a Change*, a foundational cognitive based therapy, and intensive case management/reentry case planning.

Prerelease Interventions

Early in the TJC TA period, Jacksonville's core team conducted an inventory of existing programming to determine both the prevalence of evidence-based interventions and the array of issues addressed (in order to determine any gaps). The inventory catalogued few evidence-based programs and only one cognitive-based intervention (CBI) – the *Living in Balance* curriculum used in the CTC's Matrix House. After the TJC TA team shared the research on the recidivism reduction impact of CBIs, Jacksonville stakeholders selected and prioritized implementation of the well-known *Thinking for a Change* (T4C) curriculum. Between July 2013 and July 2014, Jacksonville held two multi-day T4C staff trainings provided through additional NIC funding targeting a mix of local law enforcement, JSO correctional officers and middle-level JSO staff, and a mix of service provider partners (RRHS and JREC, primarily). The first T4C class began in October 2013 with seven inmates at the MCC. Staff trained during the first T4C training then trained other local staff (in contrast to those trained through the NIC-funded training) to build additional local capacity. The TJC TA team also provided follow-up review of classes and discussion with staff during site visits to support the fidelity of the model. Ultimately, Jacksonville conducted six rounds of T4C reaching nearly 182 inmates before the TA period ended in June 2015.

Introducing T4C for the sentenced population was an accomplishment in Jacksonville, but it necessitated a cultural shift in the JSO. According to stakeholders, through TJC, JSO and its partners recognized both the need to prioritize evidence-based programming like T4C over the many other homegrown programs in its

facilities and to reserve such services for those inmates most likely to reoffend. Time and classroom constraints further cemented that prioritization. Jacksonville initially targeted T4C toward inmates in the MCC who met the TJC eligibility criteria, establishing a 30-bed programming unit. Individuals in the MCC program unit receive the ACTS risk/needs assessment and T4C programming and meet with JREC reentry case managers to develop initial transition plans. Through this structure, JSO hopes to provide an environment that fosters and reinforces positive behavior change among individuals who are learning the same skills and concepts. The dorm is intended to enable inmates to apply the skills they develop in programs to situations they encounter in their residence. Individuals screened as high risk to recidivate who will serve *fewer* than 120 days at the MCC receive a packet of community-based referrals.

As Jacksonville expanded its new triage process, T4C was introduced in the Matrix House for CTC cases and eventually the PDF. By the end of the TA period, T4C was available to inmates in all three JSO facilities. In its efforts to expand the reach of T4C across its facilities, Jacksonville stakeholders engaged with Phase 1 TJC sites to benefit from their experiences in scheduling and staffing concurrent T4C groups. At the conclusion of the TJC TA period, Jacksonville's policy was to enroll nearly all individuals in T4C at the CTC and MCC who met the TJC eligibility criteria (i.e., those scoring as moderate- to high- risk on the Proxy) because they believed the majority would benefit from cognitive behavioral therapy. The JSO also secured a grant to fund a full-time T4C facilitator at the CTC. Jacksonville's facilitators teach T4C over 25 sessions. Completion is marked by a graduation ceremony open to inmates' families, security staff, and administrators. Indicative of their support for programming, JSO administrators have also amended their policies to allow individuals who are released before completing all T4C sessions to come back to the facility for final classes and/or T4C graduation. In Jacksonville, having correctional staff at the forefront of both training and implementation of T4C proved critical to the process and remained a significant strength of the initiative.

Jacksonville is still working to enhance its continuum of prerelease services for the target population. Thus far, the JSO has partnered with Florida State College at Jacksonville to offer GED classes and has two classrooms certified as GED test centers. The facilities continue to offer other programs, including family, employment, and substance use and mental health services. To aid in employment, Jacksonville explored employment certification in the MCC and ways to build relationships with employers in the community. In March 2014, Jacksonville added the SOAR program – SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access and Recovery — to its continuum of supports. An initiative of the Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the SOAR program "helps people with disabilities who are homeless" by linking "SOAR-trained case managers [to] work with eligible individuals to help them complete applications for benefits" (https://www.disability.gov/resource/ssissdi-outreach-access-recovery-initiative-soar/). In Jacksonville, a

SOAR representative would work with individuals who frequently returned to the jail, while in jail, to assist them with applications for SSI/SSDI benefits.

While Jacksonville filled some critical gaps in its prerelease services array, at the end of the TJC TA period the site was still working to construct and implement meaningful incentives to encourage and recognize positive behavior change.

Case Handoff and Continuity of Care

Jacksonville leveraged its partners at JREC to provide facility-based case management to the sentenced population in the MCC.[15] By enabling JREC's counselors to engage with individuals at the MCC prior to release, Jacksonville hoped both to create a direct bridge between the jail and JREC's location in the community and facilitate service engagement and utilization postrelease. In mid-2014, JREC counselors began to conduct in-reach with JSO inmates who 1) met the TJC target population criteria and 2) were eligible according to JREC's "Duval-Duval-Duval" requirements: residents of Duval County at the time of arrest, convicted of a felony in Duval County, and returning to Duval County postrelease.[16] Specifically, JREC reentry counselors are assigned to all T4C enrollees to provide prerelease case management including ACTS assessment and transition planning. Transition plans are developed based on ACTS assessment data, facilitated by the ACTS integrated assessment-case management features which aids in matching assessed needs to appropriate interventions and goal-setting. To facilitate postrelease service engagement, the JSO and JREC coordinate transportation for TJC clients from the MCC to JREC's one-stop shop in the community upon release.

Implementation of the ACTS system allowed Jacksonville to achieve a critical milestone: development and use of a universal transition case plan. ACTS not only provided a format for generating transition case plans but also a common platform for recording and updating information across key partners, specifically the JSO, JREC, and RHHS. This means key partners can literally work off the same plan and access identical client information in real time, reducing the likelihood of duplication while promoting more efficient service coordination. While the ACTS case plan is universal and readily available to all stakeholders with access to the ACTS "cloud based" platform, employing these formal case plans system-wide was still a work in progress at the end of the TJC TA period.

Community-Based Interventions

Both JREC and RRHS offer individuals a variety of services and programs in the community. Individuals housed in the Matrix House at the CTC can receive twelve months of case management and aftercare substance use and mental health services at RRHS' offices in the community. Other community based interventions largely center on JREC's case management, suite of programs, and referrals at its one-stop-shop in the community. JREC also provided additional support for T4C classes postrelease. Equipped with ACTS assessment and in-jail programming information from the JSO, JREC case managers aim to maintain weekly contact with clients. Counselors offer these contacts face to face or by telephone in an effort to accommodate individuals' job schedules. Through JADE, the community continues to explore new reentry supports and raise awareness across providers about one another's services to ensure individuals returning to Jacksonville are connected to all available resources.

Self-Evaluation and Sustainability

Self-evaluation uses objective data to guide operations, monitor progress, and inform decisionmaking about changes or improvements that may need to be made to the initiative. Sustainability is the use of strategies and mechanisms to ensure that the gains or progress of the initiative continue regardless of changes in leadership, policy, funding, or staffing. Self-evaluation and sustainability are interlinked and reinforce one another. Here, we examine Jacksonville's use of data to inform, monitor, and refine its jail reentry processes and guide decisionmaking. We also explore the steps taken to ensure the sustainability of its jail transition work. Remaining priorities for implementation are also discussed.

Self-Evaluation and Data-Driven Approaches

As discussed earlier in this report, Jacksonville brought critical data and strong analytic capabilities to the initiative. The JSO's CMIS collected standard operations data necessary to compute length of stays and facility-based data, and the recent acquisition of a program module held promise for tracking inmate exposure to a variety of prerelease services. In turn, JREC collected critical data on postrelease engagement and completion of services; RHHS reportedly collected similar data. By engaging two staff from the JSO's Crime Analysis Unit and an officer from JSO's IT department in the core team and its data and evaluation working group, the Jacksonville collaborative was well-positioned to undertake the type of data-drive analyses needed to inform strategy development, monitor implementation, and make mid-course corrections.

During the TJC TA period, Jacksonville's core team worked in partnership with the CAU to perform critical analyses such as aggregate and by-facility Proxy profiles of JSO's inmate population, and analyses to verify the predictive capacity of the Proxy for JSO offenders. Through the CAU's work, the core team quickly found that the new screening and assessment tools could inform both individual-level program enrollment decisions and system-level decisions. For example, its early Proxy analyses quickly determined which facilities housed the TJC target population. This was significant because, at the outset of the site's TJC work, stakeholders did not expect the MCC's residents would fit into Jacksonville's target population. Yet, the CAU's analysis, indicated there were, in fact, many eligible individuals at the MCC—enough to eventually open a 30-bed programs unit there. Thus, the information gleaned from analyses of the Proxy helped the TJC core team realize that the site's new reentry approach needed to expend resources in both of the JSO's sentenced facilities (MCC and CTC)—both at the planning level (i.e., involving staff members from the MCC in the core team) and at the implementation stage (i.e., offering case management and T4C at the MCC).

As the initiative's system-wide focus turned to examination of the CTC's operations, the data and evaluation group analyzed the Proxy risk profile of inmates served by the CTC's various programs. This "point in time" analysis of 245 inmates housed at the CTC on February 7, 2014 indicated the facility's programs were generally serving individuals at the correct risk level: approximately 20–25 percent of the facility's inmates scored as low risk, and 75–80 percent scored as moderate to high risk. Further analyses revealed that the nearly 82 percent of the facility's low risk inmates were work furlough participants, and that the majority of its high risk inmates were served in the intensive Matrix House treatment program. While largely confirmatory, these analyses provided additional context to on-going discussions to add *Thinking for a Change* to the CTC's menu of core services. Ultimately, T4C was introduced to the Matrix House program with multiple groups operating in order to serve the program's entire population.

The addition of ACTS as the site's risk assessment tool also held great promise for performance management analyses. As discussed earlier, JSO, RRHS, and JREC staff could access and share information on individuals' risks and needs to manage case planning and service delivery, but ACTS also had the capabilities of generating aggregate-level information on the target population that could offer the core team a system-level view of operations. While the ACTS system was largely operational at the conclusion of the TJC TA period, the site experienced some technical challenges. At the conclusion of the TJC TA period, CAU staff were still working with ACTS administrators to access the system's full analytic capabilities.

Although Jacksonville had a history of using data to monitor and inform operations, these analyses focused largely on patrol operations or calculating the jail's recidivism rate. Through TJC, Jacksonville introduced a number of performance indicators to monitor and measure key reentry processes. The core team started to routinely collect and report on risk screening and assessment, and with the addition of the ACTS system, to report on the needs of assessed individuals. As discussed in the Conclusions section of this report, while Jacksonville made good progress utilizing data generated from its new risk screening procedures, it did not take full advantage of its substantial analytic capabilities, in part, due to factors beyond its control (i.e., technological barriers around implementation of ACTS). Once the site is able to more fully access and routinely analyze data across the CMIS, ACTS and JREC systems, it will be better positioned to monitor, modify, and improve Jacksonville's reentry system.

Sustaining Jail Reentry in Jacksonville

A central goal of the TJC initiative is to build jail-to-community transition efforts that endure. Sustainability involves the use of strategies and mechanisms to ensure that the gains or progress of the initiative are

sustained over time despite changes in leadership, policy, funding, and staffing. There are a number of mechanisms to facilitate sustainability such as formalizing new procedures in written policy, signing partnership agreements that specify partner roles and responsibilities, and leveraging financial support. One stakeholder observed early in the initiative that Jacksonville had a tradition of enthusiastically supporting and pursuing new practices to enhance its jail systems, including programs such as mediation and restorative justice, but that sustainability boiled down to what happened *after* the end of technical assistance:

> "keeping it going is what would really signal sustainability. We could be saying this to say we did it, or to really make a difference. I've been part of other teams…is any of that going on in the Sheriff's office? No. Consistency would be proof."

In this vein, Jacksonville took a number of steps to ensure that the gains made during the TJC TA period would endure. First, the site committed to advance its work through the Quality Assurance committee, which would continue to meet according to its regular schedule. Secondly, the team's Programs Lieutenant was designated to spearhead these QA committee meetings; this individual had assumed increasing responsibilities for the core team meetings and agenda in the months leading up to the conclusion of the TA work and was well-positioned to continue in this leadership role. Thirdly, the site had worked to incorporate programming (T4C) and case coordination in such a way that neither would require additional funding: Jacksonville trained corrections officers and RRHS staff to deliver T4C, and covered JREC planning under existing allocations; of equal importance, these efforts generated momentum and support of their local TJC model. Lastly, the core team took initial steps to ensure the continued use of core practices and processes implemented under TJC by drafting written policies around these practices that could be accessed by JSO staff across the system. Moreover, the aforementioned QA committee was initiated to monitor fidelity to TJC processes, including assessment and delivery of cognitive behavioral programming.

Sustaining Core TJC Practices

Cognizant of the key role staff play in the success of any systems change effort, Jacksonville took several steps to introduce line staff to the initiative (as alluded to in earlier sections of this report). First, the JSO developed in-service trainings for its security staff on TJC that covered TJC's core principles and practices such as screening and assessment, T4C, and case management coordination with JREC. The goal of these trainings is to educate officers on the underlying philosophy of reentry and service provision to inmates and enhance support for these practices. JSO leadership administers the training in an effort to communicate the organization's commitment to this new way of business.

Second, with the support of NIC, Jacksonville held several T4C trainings targeting a variety of stakeholders ranging from correctional officers and mid-management security staff to treatment providers, and even police officers. The T4C training sessions served a dual purpose: to train facilitators so that JSO could expand its jail-based cognitive behavioral programming and to educate these key stakeholders on Jacksonville's new approach to programming.

Stakeholders reported that training security and RRHS staff to facilitate T4C sessions was particularly important to change attitudes about reentry and rehabilitation. Yet, while these trainings achieved some success in furthering Jacksonville's reentry culture, they may have also contributed to some confusion: some staff seemed to misattribute TJC to a singular program—T4C—rather than a systems-change approach. On reflection, several stakeholders remarked that Jacksonville would have benefitted from educating staff about TJC and its processes much earlier in the initiative and, for those individuals invited to participate in working groups and the core team, from providing more information about the initiative and how their specific role fit into the work.

Conclusion

Jacksonville joined the TJC initiative as a learning site to build on and expand its demonstrated commitment to reentry by addressing critical gaps in reentry practice and programming necessary to construct an evidence-based jail strategy for inmates returning to Duval County after a period of incarceration in JSO's facilities. Jacksonville stakeholders sought to accomplish this overarching goal by 1) selecting and implementing both a universal risk screener to measure risk to reoffend and risk/needs assessment; (2) analyses of the jail population by risk to reoffend; (3) instituting cognitive-based interventions for those inmates at moderate- to high-risk of reoffending; (4) enhancing its array of prerelease services including prerelease case management and transition planning; and (5) instituting a universal transition case plan.

As detailed in this report, Jacksonville made considerable progress in realizing these objectives. The site selected the Proxy risk screener and integrated the tool into its booking process such that risk-to-reoffend data now exist for every individual who enters a JSO facility. The ability to quickly sort the jail population by risk to reoffend, as opposed to sorting by charge or institutional security risk, is foundational for any local recidivism reduction approach. Further, the site used the Proxy data to monitor population characteristics and to determine inmate programming needs by facility as well as the feasibility of expanding in-jail programming to previously under-served populations – namely MCC inmates. Jacksonville then advanced its efforts to create a coordinated reentry approach that begins in the facility and continues into the community by implementing the ACTS assessment and case management system. Utilization of the ACTS assessment provides critical risk/needs data and a platform for design of a transition plan responsive to those risks and needs. Training facility and community-based staff on T4C and making T4C a core component of its reentry strategy represents another critical milestone in Jacksonville's work. Integrating JREC's reentry counselors more fully into the site's local reentry efforts, by allowing them to work with inmates in the MCC prior to release, further advanced Jacksonville's efforts to create a seamless handoff to the community. Lastly, the Jacksonville team identified and committed to a structure for advancing and refining its jail reentry work after the TA period ended: its Quality Assurance committee will maintain its regular schedule, membership, and leadership. It is important to keep in mind that Jacksonville accomplished these advances over a 30-month period.

Despite these considerable gains, important work remains. To fully implement the TJC model and enhance the jurisdiction's jail transition approach, Jacksonville should address the following:

- **Proactively engage criminal justice and community-based stakeholder groups like the CJCC on the issue of jail reentry.** Although Jacksonville took a number of tangible steps to ensure continued use

of new practices and procedures at the operational level, it must also continue to educate key criminal justice and community leaders on the initiative's key principles and its progress. The QA committee should plan to regularly update key leaders on jail reentry work and use these opportunities to leverage support to address key needs or resolve potential barriers.

- **More fully engage the community in its jail transition efforts**. Jacksonville should work to meaningfully and strategically engage additional community-based partners beyond its very strong partnerships with JREC and RRHS to include direct contact with other service providers (e.g., housing, job preparedness, faith-based organizations, mentoring); one step would be to systematically engage additional providers in routine working group meetings. This could happen indirectly, through JADE, or directly, with partners they have utilized less-frequently.

- **Continue to expand its continuum of evidence-based programming pre- and postrelease** to increase the likelihood that inmates' multiple needs can be met. Jacksonville made great strides in this area by implementing the *Thinking for a Change* cognitive intervention, but work should continue to more fully ensure the array of programming for medium and high risk inmates are both evidence-based and grounded in a cognitive approach when appropriate. Relatedly, all programs should be monitored and observed routinely by trained staff to ensure that such interventions are delivered with fidelity. Lastly, Jacksonville should work to train additional community-based providers on T4C to expanded postrelease CBT service provision.

- **Utilize the ACTS system to monitor operations and improve performance.** Once fully integrated and operational, Jacksonville must work to extract and analyze assessment and program usage data, and ultimately, to monitor, modify, and improve Jacksonville's reentry system using that information. Doing so will optimize critical reentry outcomes. Additionally, Jacksonville should analyze the needs profile of the jail population (in terms of prevalence of various needs) based on systematic review of the ACTS assessment proceeds to identify and fill potential programming gaps, as well as to enhance the integrity of needs matching.

- **Implement a performance measurement strategy**. TJC provides a core framework for performance measurement and monitoring. Through its Crime Analysis Unit, the JSO has ample capabilities to more fully document, adopt, augment, and utilize the TJC core performance measures, particularly analyses of postrelease outcomes. Jacksonville should make regular review view of these data in its QA committee a priority in order to aid in decision-making and planning.

- **Monitor the transition process**. Establishing a universal transition case plan was a critical milestone for the Jacksonville TJC collaborative. As Jacksonville stakeholders noted at the outset of TJC TA, ,

although inmates in mental health and substance abuse treatment received case plans, there was no universal transition case plan for returning inmates, and neither case management nor programming were based on risks/needs assessment; the highest risk inmates were not prioritized for intervention. Using the detailed information collected and housed in its ACTS system, stakeholders should routinely review transition case plans to determine their responsiveness to assessed needs and any potential gaps. Additionally, as Jacksonville progresses in its transition work, dosage should be measured to ensure its TJC target population is receiving an appropriate level of intervention consistent with the research.

Jacksonville stakeholders recognize that systems change like that of the TJC initiative is an on-going endeavor that requires time, resources, and leadership. Accordingly, critical elements are in place in Jacksonville to build on the substantial gains made and lessons learned during the TJC TA period and to continue this important work.

Notes

1. "List of Consolidated City-County Governments," National League of Cities, accessed May 23, 2016, http://www.nlc.org/build-skills-and-networks/resources/cities-101/city-structures/list-of-consolidated-city-county-governments.

2. During TJC, the jail's average daily population ranged between 3,100 and 3,400 inmates.

3. Security ratings at the three facilities are as follows: the PDF holds maximum security inmates, the MCC holds medium security inmates, and the CTC holds minimum security inmates.

4. In addition to Matrix House, the following services were also available through RRHS: co-occurring mental health treatment; relapse prevention, residential treatment; HIV/AIDS education; risk assessments and rapid testing services; case management and referral services; trauma-informed services, including assessment and interventions for emotional, sexual, and physical abuse; employment readiness, training, and placement; education and tutoring assistance for obtaining a GED and higher education; and, support activities such as groups, mentoring and coaching. "Services," River Region Human Services, accessed May 24, 2016, http://www.rrhs.org/services/.

5. "Jacksonville Re-entry Center: 'The Portal of Entry' to Life after Incarceration," Jacksonville Re-entry Center, accessed May 24, 2016, http://www.coj.net/departments/sheriffs-office/docs/department-of-corrections/jrec-final-08112009-1-.aspx.

6. JREC assists returning individuals with basic needs such as transportation and obtaining identification, and links them to an array of services ranging from intensive case management, employment and housing supports, and legal assistance. JREC also offers a variety of programming on site: chemical dependency, sex offender and mental health treatment; mentoring; education; and employment.

7. In particular, Jacksonville hoped to expand its ability to assist returning jail inmates with housing, employment, and public benefits, and to address the unique needs of distinct inmate populations (i.e., medication assistance and temporary housing for individuals with chronic mental health issues).

8. Edward J. Latessa, "Cutting Recidivism: What Works, What Doesn't," *The-Slammer*, January 25, 2010, http://www.the-slammer.org/carousel/cutting-recidivism-what-works-what-doesn%E2%80%99t.

9. Initially, the JSO did not focus on the CTC because of that facility's structure for pre-and postrelease services; as work progressed, the team recognized the importance of including the CTC team.

10. The CJCC is, by statute, composed of the State's Attorney and Public Defender, or their designees; a circuit judge; a county judge; chief correctional officer; the Sheriff; Probation circuit administrator; local court administrator; director of probation or pretrial intervention, or designee; director of a local substance abuse program; a representative of local homeless program; director of detention facility or designee; chief probation officer of the Department of Juvenile Justice or designee; and a Police chief or designee. The group meets quarterly. See "Project Narrative," accessed May 23, 2016, http://www.floridatac.com/files/document/Pages%20from%20Duval_CJMHSA_LHZ02_Application_Redacted.pdf.

11. At the time of the first technical assistance site visit in November 2012, the PDF had just begun to pilot a well-known screening tool, but stakeholders found the time required to administer the tool's more than a dozen items to be prohibitive and were looking for guidance on alternatives.

12. Figure 5 also indicates a relatively large share of low risk offenders in the CTC, which also houses work release inmates.

13. Among the reports generated by the ACTS assessment and case management system: Quick Screen Risk Score; Full Risk Assessment; Full Assessment of Criminogenic Need; Assessment of Change Readiness and Criminal Thinking; Directed, Jurisdiction Specific Transition Planning; Targeted Transition Planning Strategies with Progress Notes;

Trackable outcomes of all Transition Efforts; Risk Screening; Report of Whole Jail Offender Risk Classification; Analysis of Jail Offender Need Classification; Analysis of Offender Outcomes by System, Unit, Program Application, and/or Officer/Practitioner; Quality Assurance/Fidelity of Application; Projection of Type and Number of System Bed Needs. See "ACTS: Applied Correctional Transition Strategy Software," Black Creek ISC, accessed May 23, 2016, http://www.blackcreekisc.com/PDFs/Transitional_Strategy_Systems_ACTS.pdf; "ACTS," Corrections Partners, accessed May 23, 2016, http://www.correctionspartners.com/ACTS.html.

14. Jacksonville stakeholders chose not to prioritize inmates scoring 8 on the Proxy; these inmates comprised roughly 3 percent of the MCC population and 8 percent of the CTC.

15. Although prior to TJC, JREC predominantly served individuals returning from state incarceration in the Florida Department of Corrections, JREC was a resource for JSO clients leaving the CTC following a sentence of 6 months or more.

16. It is important to note that individuals who did not meet all the criteria could access other services at JREC including healthcare assistance and workforce certifications, such as OSHA

References

Andrews, D. A., and James Bonta, eds. 2010. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct.* 5th ed. New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender & Company.

Bonta, James, and D. A. Andrews. 2007. *Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation*. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada. http://www.pbpp.pa.gov/Information/Documents/Research/EBP7.pdf.

Bogue, Brad, William Woodward, and Lore Joplin. 2006. *Using a Proxy Score to Pre-screen Offenders for Risk to Reoffend*. http://www.pretrial.org/download/risk-assessment/Using%20a%20Proxy%20Score%20to%20Pre-screen%20Offenders%20(Bogue,%20Woodward,%20Joplin%202006).pdf.

Buck Willison, Janeen, Jesse Jannetta, Hannah Dodd, S. Rebecca Neusteter, Kevin Warwick, Kaitlin Greer, and Andrea Matthews. 2012. *Process and Systems Change Evaluation Findings from the Transition from Jail to Community Initiative.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/research/publication/process-and-systems-change-evaluation-findings-transition-jail-community.

Byrne, James M., Faye S. Taxman, and Don Hummer. 2005. *An Evaluation of the Implementation and Impact of NIC's Institutional Culture Initiative*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. http://faculty.uml.edu/jbyrne/44.327/FINALVERSION(10-23-2005).doc.

Greenberg, Greg A., and Robert A. Rosenheck. 2008. "Jail Incarceration, Homelessness, and Mental Health: A National Study." *Psychiatric Services* 59 (2): 170–77.

James, Doris J., and Lauren E. Glaze. 2006. "Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/mhppji.pdf.

Karberg, Jennifer C., and Doris J. James. 2005. "Substance Dependence, Abuse, and Treatment of Jail Inmates, 2002." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/sdatji02.pdf.

JSO (Jacksonville Sheriff's Office). 2006. "Report to the Community 2006." Jacksonville, FL: Jacksonville Sheriff's Office. http://www.jaxsheriff.org/departments/sheriffs-office/docs/electronic--press-room-home-page/jso-annual-report.aspx.

Lipsey, Mark W., Nana A. Landenberger, and Sandra J. Wilson. 2007. "Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Programs for Criminal Offenders." *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 3 (6).

Lowenkamp, Christopher T., and Edward J. Latessa. 2004. "Understanding the Risk Principle: How and Why Correctional Interventions Can Harm Low-Risk Offenders." In *Topics in Community Corrections,* 3–8. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/articles/ticc04_final_complete.pdf.

Lowenkamp, Christopher T., Edward J. Latessa, and Alexander M. Holsinger. 2006. "The Risk Principle in Action: What Have We Learned from 13,676 Offenders and 97 Correctional Programs?" *Crime & Delinquency* 52 (1): 77–93.

Maruschak, Laura M. 2006. "Medical Problems of Jail Inmates." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/mpji.pdf.

Matthews, Betsy, Dana Jones Hubbard, and Edward J. Latessa. 2001. "Making the Next Step: Using Evaluability Assessment to Improve Correctional Programming." *The Prison Journal* 81 (4): 454–72.

Minton, Todd D., and Daniela Golinelli. 2014. "Jail Inmates at Midyear 2013—Statistical Tables*."* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/jim13st.pdf.

Pearson, Frank S., Douglas S. Lipton, Charles M. Cleland, and Dorine S. Yee. 2002. "The Effects of Behavioral/Cognitive-Behavioral Programs on Recidivism." *Crime and Delinquency* 48 (3): 476–96.

Roman, John, Michael Kane, Emily Turner, and Beverly Frazier. 2006. *Instituting Lasting Reforms for Prisoner Reentry in Philadelphia*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/research/publication/instituting-lasting-reforms-prisoner-reentry-philadelphia.

Schein, Edgar H. "Culture: The Missing Concept in Organization Studies." 1996. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (2): 229–40.

Stephan, James, and Georgette Walsh. 2011. *Census of Jail Facilities, 2006.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cjf06.pdf.

Uchida, Craig D., Stefan LoBuglio, Shawn Flower, Anne M. Piehl, and Teresa Still. 2009. *Measuring Jail Recidivism in Montgomery County, Maryland*. Silver Spring, MD: Justice and Security Strategies. https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COR/Resources/Files/PDF/PRRSFinalRecidivismReport-Dec-16%202009.pdf.

Wilson, David B., Leana Allen Bouffard, and Doris L. MacKenzie. 2005. "A Quantitative Review of Structured, Group-Oriented, Cognitive-Behavioral Programs for Offenders." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 32 (2): 172–204.

Wolf Harlow, Caroline. 2003. "Education and Correctional Populations." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf.

Statement of Independence

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.

URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org